MR. S. KRISHNA PILLAI (*Karunagapalli*): Then, may I know what the sort of license is that has been granted to the Travancore Minerals Company?

MR. A. KUMARA PILLAI (*Secretary to Government*): Sir, we are at question No. 9 now.

MR. S. KRISHNA PILLAI (*Karunagapllai*): I am sorry, Sir.

In regard to question No. 9, may I know whether, at the time the application was pending, there was any motion in this House asking for leave to discuss the question?

MR. A. KUMARA PILLAI (*Secretary to Government*): I have no information.

PRESIDENT: I do not think that arises out of your interpellation, Mr. Krishna Pillai.

MR. S. KRISHNA PILLAI (*Karunagapalli*): Is the member aware that, in 1931, the Government assured this House that there was no application for any prospecting license for removing kaolin?

MR. A. KUMARA PILLAI (*Secretary to Government*): I am not aware of that.

Grant of monopoly for the removal of monazite.

10. MR. S. KRISHNA PILLAI (*Karunagapalli*): Will the Government be pleased to state:

(*a*) whether there is any monopoly granted to any company working in Travancore for working and removing monazite from Travancore;

(*b*) whether that company is still (24-10-1107) carrying on any work in the removal of the same; and

(*c*) if so, the annual fee paid by such company?

MR. A. KUMARA PILLAI (*Secretary to Government*): (*a*) No.

(*b*) and (*c*) These questions do not arise.

MR. S. KRISHNA PILLAI (*Karunagapalli*): Has any monopoly been granted to any individual or company working in Travancore for removing monazite from any part of Travancore?

MR. A. KUMARA PILLAI (*Secretary to Government*): Prospecting licenses have been granted to certain companies. No monopoly has been granted.

MR. S. KRISHNA PILLAI (*Karunagapalli*): May I know whether the license granted amounts to a monopoly?

MR. A. KUMARA PILLAI (*Secretary to Government*): No; it does not.

MR. S. KRISHNA PILLAI (*Karunagapalli*): Under the terms of the agreement with the prospecting licensees, have the Government a right to grant similar licenses to any other person for prospecting for the same mineral in the same locality?

MR. A. KUMARA PILLAI (*Secretary to Government*): No; Government cannot do it.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Page 1

MR. S. KRISHNA PILLAI (*Karunagapalli*) : Then, does not the member concede that it amounts to a monopoly so far as the particular mineral and the particular locality are concerned?

MR. A. KUMARA PILLAI (*Secretary to Government*): I do not think the license can be called a monopoly. It is nothing more than the exclusive right to prospect for the particular mineral in the particular locality. I think there is some difference between such exclusive right and monopoly as it is ordinarily understood.

MR. S. KRISHNA PILLAI (*Karunagapalli*) : May I request the member to make the distinction clearer? (*Laughter.*)

MR. A. KUMARA PILLAI (*Secretary to Government*) : If it is a monopoly there could be no restriction about the locality. It must be for the whole State.

MR. S. KRISHNA PILLAI (*Karunagapalli*) : Is that the sense in which the word "monopoly" has been used in the answer, which says that no monopoly has been granted?

MR. A. KUMARA PILLAI (*Secretary to Government*) : Perhaps it may be called a monopoly with respect to the particular area.

MR. S. KRISHNA PILLAI (*Karunagapalli*) : May I know the area for which the monopoly now in question has been granted?

MR. A. KUMARA PILLAI (*Secretary to Governmnent*) : It extends from Cape Comorin to Paravur, near Quilon, about seventy-nine miles in length, for a width of a furlong from the sea.

MR. S. KRISHNA PILLAI (*Karunagapalli*) : Does the member concede that any other person or company can be given prospecting license for that region?

MR. A. KUMARA PILLAI (*Secretary to Government*) : No, not during the period for which the present license has been given.

MR. S. KRISHNA PILLAI (*Karunagapalli*) : Has the license been granted for ever or has any period been fixed?

MR. A. KUMARA PILLAI (*Secretary to Government*) : No. Prospecting license can never be a grant for ever.

MR. S. KRISHNA PILLAI (*Karunagapalli*) : Then, what is the period for which it has been granted?

MR. A KUMARA PILLAI (*Secretary to Government*) : Only for one year.

MR. S. KRISHNA PILLAI (*Karunagapalli*) : Does the member suggest that at the end of every year this license is to be renewed?

MR. A. KUMARA PILLAI (*Secretary to Government*) : I hope the member wants the information with reference to the Travancore Minerals Company.

MR. S. KRISHNA PILLAI (*Karunagapalli*) : I am not concerned with the name of the company. What I want to know is whether the license has been granted for ever or for a fixed period or whether it is to be renewed every year.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

MR. A. KUMARA PILLAI (*Secretary to Government*) : It is certainly not a permanent grant. I think the period of the licenses is 20 years.

MR. S. KRISHNA PILLAI (*Karunagapalli*) : What was the period and the area for which prospecting license was originally granted?

MR. A. KUMARA PILLAI (*Secretary to Government*) : To whom?

MR. S. KRISHNA PILLAI (*Karunagapalli*) : To some individual or company; I am not concerned with the name.

MR. A. KUMARA PILLAI (*Secretary to Government*) : The company was not given any license before.

MR. S. KRISHNA PILLAI (*Karunagapalli*) : Was this the only area for which the license was originally granted, or was the original grant subsequently varied?

MR. A. KUMARA PILLAI (*Secretary to Government*) : The question is vague, Sir. I am not able to understand which grant the member is referring to.

MR. S. KRISHNA PILLAI (*Karunagapalli*) : How many companies are there to whom such license has been granted with respect to the region between Cape Comorin and Paravur?

MR. A. KUMARA PILLAI (*Secretary to Government*) : Only one.

MR. S. KRISHNA PILLAI (*Karunagapalli*) : It is the license granted to that company that I am now referring to. What was the period for which the original grant was made? And, what was the area?

MR. A. KUMARA PILLAI (*Secretary to Government*) : This is the first grant.

MR. S. KRISHNA PILLAI (*Karunagapalli*) : Does the member imply that the grant originally made was not at any time revised or cancelled?

MR. A. KUMARA PILLAI (*Secretary to Government*) : So far as this particular company is concerned this is the first time that the grant has been made.

PRESIDENT : Mr. Krishna Pillai, I do not think it would be fair to expect the member to answer all these supplementary questions.

MR. S. KRISHNA PILLAI (*Karunagapalli*) : I have to ask the same supplementary questions with respect to the next question also.

PRESIDENT : If you want any information you better write to Government separately. The Secretary is obviously not prepared to give the information you want. It will take time for him to get the information for you.

MR. S. KRISHNA PILLAI (*Karunagapalli*) : May I suggest, Sir, that the Secretaries to Government ought not to be encouraged in that habit. Unless supplementary questions are answered here they would lose the importance and the sanctity attached to interpellations. If our questions are answered here, the whole House and the public

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Mr. S. Krishna Pillai.]

would be in a position to appreciate correctly the position of Government. On the other hand, if I write to Government and get the information I want, it would be of help only to me personally.

PRESIDENT: In theory, Mr. Krishna Pillai, perhaps what you say is correct; but, at the moment, the Secretary does not seem to have the information you want.

Grant of monopoly for removal of ilmenite.

11. **MR. S. KRISHNA PILLAI** (*Karunagapalli*): Will the Government be pleased to state:

(*a*) whether there is any company enjoying any monopoly for working ilmenite from Travancore; and

(*b*) if so, whether any variation was made in the original grant and with what loss to Government?

MR. A. KUMARA PILLAI (*Secretary to Government*): (*a*) No.

(*b*) The question does not arise.

Loss incurred by the punja cultivators in the Mavelikara and Kartikapalli taluks in 1104.

12. **MR. A. S. DAMODARAN ASAN** (*Mavelikara* cum *Kartikapalli*): Will the Government be pleased to state:

(*a*) whether any report has been prepared and submitted by the Land Revenue Commissioner about the loss caused to the *punja* cultivators of the Mavelikara and Kartikapalli taluks due to the untimely rains of 1104; and

(*b*) if the answer to part (*a*) is in the affirmative, the date of the report and the orders passed thereon?

MR. P. VISVANATHA AIYAR (*Secretary to Government*): (*a*) The answer is in the affirmative.

(*b*) The 18th July 1929 and the 8th March 1930.

The Quilon Dewan Peishkar reported that though there was heavy loss to the cultivators, the damage was not so serious as to call for remission of taxes and that, further, the Remission Rules contemplated remission only in specified areas and were not applicable to the Mavelikara and Kartikapalli taluks. He was, therefore, of opinion that the best form of relief was by way of granting agricultural loans to the ryots who suffered heavy loss on account of the flood. The Land Revenue Commissioner, however, recommended remission of taxes as a special case to such of the *punja* cultivators in the above two taluks as had seriously suffered from failure of crops on account of the floods. But, as it was found that agricultural loans had been granted to sufferers, no further action was thought necessary in the matter.

MR. A. S. DAMODARAN ASAN (*Mavelikara* cum *Kartikapalli*): With reference to the answer to part (*c*), may I know the date on which the Government received the report of the Dewan Peishkar?

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly